

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 2, 3, and 7-13 are canceled, claims 1, 4-6, and 14 are amended.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 14 because of the misspelling of the word arranged. Applicant has amended claim 14 to correct the spelling of arranged. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to the phrase “the seat cushion is forwardly and is moved rearwardly while being vertically shifted during the rotation of the seat back”. By this Amendment Applicant has amended claim 6 to read “the seat cushion is moved forwardly and rearwardly while being vertically shifted”. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 13-15 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 1,427,280 to Gahm. By this amendment applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the limitations:

a seat back forwardly and rearwardly rotatably supported on a vehicle floor bracket via an axle having a rotational axis;
a supporting mechanism movably supporting the seat cushion on the vehicle floor bracket; and
a connecting mechanism interconnecting the seat cushion and seat back, the connecting mechanism comprising a first linking member fixedly connected to the seat cushion and a second linking member rotatably connected to the seat back via a first pivot pin that is offset from the rotational axis of the seat back; and

wherein the first and second linking members are restrictively rotatably interconnected via a second pivot pin such that when the seat back is rotated forwardly from a normal position, the first and second linking members are inhibited from rotation relative to each other, so that the seat cushion can be repositioned forwardly and downwardly and that when the seat back is rotated rearwardly from the normal position, the first and second linking members are rotated relative to each other so that the seat cushion can be maintained in a substantially stationary position.

The Gahm reference does not teach or suggest the above recited limitations in combination with the other limitations already present in claim 1. In particular, the Gahm reference does not teach or suggest a first or second linking member or a pivot pin offset from the rotational axis. Therefore, claim 1 as amended should be patentable over the Gahm reference and claims 4-6 which depend from claim 1 should be patentable for the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

Applicant has amended claim 14 to recite the limitation "a second linking member rotatably connected to the seat back via a pivot pin that is offset of the rotational axis of the seat back." The Gahm reference does not teach or suggest the above recited limitation in combination with the other limitations already present in claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 as amended should be patentable over the Gahm reference. Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and should be patentable for the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 2, 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,152,533 to Smuk. As indicated above, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite certain limitations. These limitations are not taught or suggested by Smuk in combination with the other limitations already present in claim 1. In particular, Smuk does not teach or suggest a linking member rotatably connected to the seat back via a first pivot

pin and there is no restriction to the rotation of the pivot pin when the seat back is rotated forwardly. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the Smuk reference. Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 and should be patentable for the same reasons indicated above. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 8 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Gahm in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 466,047 to Bauer et al. As indicated above Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite additional limitations. These limitations are not found in either the Gahm or the Bauer reference in combination with the limitations already present in claim 1. Specifically, neither the Gahm or Bauer reference teaches or suggests a first or second linking member or the second member being rotatably connected to the seat back by a pivot pin offset from the rotational axis. Further, there is no restricted rotatable interconnection via a second pivot pin disclosed in either Gahm or Bauer. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended is not obvious in light of the Gahm and Bauer references. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is not obvious over the Gahm and Bauer references for the same reasons indicated for claim 1. Claims 8 and 12 have been canceled rendering the rejection moot with regard to claims 8 and 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul C. Onderick', with a stylized, cursive script.

Paul C. Onderick
Registration No. 45,354

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5766